arXiv:1609.02315v1 [math.DG] 8 Sep 2016

INDEX OF THE CRITICAL CATENOID

BAPTISTE DEVYVER

Abstract. In this article, we show that the critical catenoid, as a free boundary minimal surface of the unit ball in $\mathbb{R}^3$, has index 4. We also prove that a free boundary minimal surface of the unit ball in $\mathbb{R}^3$, that is not a flat disk, has index at least 4.

1. Introduction

The series of recent articles [9], [10] by A. Fraser and R. Schoen triggered a renewed interest for free boundary minimal surfaces. More specifically, Fraser and Schoen studied mainly free boundary minimal surfaces in the unit ball $\mathbb{B}^3$ of $\mathbb{R}^3$, and in [9], they provide two interesting examples of those, namely the *critical catenoid* (a rescaled piece of the usual catenoid in $\mathbb{R}^3$), and the *critical Möbius band* (which is non-orientable). They also constructed in [10] free boundary minimal surfaces in $\mathbb{B}^3$ of genus 0 and with an arbitrary number of boundary components. Guided by an hypothetical analogy between (closed) minimal surfaces of S^3 and free boundary minimal surfaces of $\mathbb{B}^3$, P. Sargent [13] and independently L. Ambrozio, A. Carlotto and B. Sharp [2], have given lower estimates for the Morse index of free boundary minimal surfaces, in terms of their topology, similar to the one found by A. Savo [14] for minimal surfaces . A heuristic that has been in the air for some time concerning the analogy between closed minimal surfaces of S^3 and free boundary minimal surfaces of $\mathbb{B}^3$ is the following: since the Clifford torus is arguably the simplest non-trivial closed minimal surface in S^3, and the critical catenoid is the simplest non-trivial free boundary minimal surface in $\mathbb{B}^3$, is it possible that the two be "analogous" in some sense? There are several celebrated characterizations of the Clifford torus: it is the unique minimal torus in S^3 (Lawson's conjecture, proved by S. Brendle [3]), it has minimal Willmore energy among all tori in S^3 (Willmore conjecture, proved by F. Coda Marques and A. Neves [6]), and finally, it has minimal index (equal to 5) among all non-totally geodesic minimal surfaces in S^3 (F. Urbano, [12]). Actually, Urbano's result has been important in Coda Marques and Neves' approach. It is very natural to ask whether a similar characterization to Urbano's for the Clifford torus holds as well for the critical catenoid. Certainly, many mathematicians apart from us wondered about a possible Urbano-type result for the critical catenoid. However, while it is quite easy to compute the index of the Clifford torus, computing the index of the critical catenoid is harder, due to the presence of the boundary and the more complicated equations. Our main goal in this article will be to show the following result:

Theorem 1.1. *Every minimal, free boundary minimal surface in the unit ball $\mathbb{B}^3$, is either a flat disk passing through the origin (and in this case has index 1), or has index at least 4. Moreover, the index of the critical catenoid is exactly 4. Allso, the critical catenoid has nullity equal to 7, for some appropriate notion of nullity.*

Remark 1.2. The computation of the index of the critical catenoid was carried out by the author in April 2015. However, rather than publishing a proof directly, we felt it would have been worth waiting to have a full proof of an Urbano-type result for the catenoid, and we started to work in this direction in collaboration with A. Fraser. Having learned that two other teams

(G. Smith-D. Zhou on the one hand, H. Tran on the other) very recently computed the index of the critical catenoid and were willing to publish the result right away, we decided to publish our proof, as well as a few other related results. To the author's best knowledge, all three proofs are different, and have been obtained independently.

Remark 1.3. As we shall see in Section 2, there are two perfectly valid definitions for the nullity. The number 7 is valid for one of the two definitions, but if the other definition is chosen, then the nullity is equal to 3.

The plan of this article is as follows: in Section 2, we set up the setting and recall well-known definitions. In Section 3, we present the critical catenoid and make a number of remarks on it. We also introduce suitable coordinates. In Section 4, we use Fourier analysis techniques to study the Dirichlet problem for the stability operator on the catenoid, that is instrumental in our proof of Theorem 1.1. In Section 5, we prove the part of Theorem 1.1 pertaining to the critical catenoid (see Theorem 5.1). Finally, in Section 6, we finish the proof of Theorem 1.1, by proving the universal lower bound on the index (see Proposition 6.1). We also present some partial results towards a characterization of the critical catenoid as the unique index 4 free boundary minimal surface in the unit ball $\mathbb{B}^3$.

Acknowledgments

The author is thankful to A. Fraser for introduced him to this problem, as well as for many interesting discussions. What is more, all the results contained in Section 6 of this paper have been obtained in collaboration with A. Fraser.

During the time this research was carried out, the author was partially supported by the Natural Sciences and Engineering Research Council of Canada through a post-doctoral fellowship.

2. Free boundary minimal surfaces in the ball

Let Σ be a free boundary minimal surface in the unit ball $\mathbb{B}^3$ of $\mathbb{R}^3$. By this, we mean that Σ is a minimal surface with boundary inside $\mathbb{B}^3$, such that the boundary of Σ lies entirely in the unit sphere S^2 and Σ intersects S^2 orthogonally. Equivalently, the exterior normal ν to Σ on $\partial\Sigma$, coincide with the position vector X. Free boundary minimal surfaces arise as critical points of the area functional restricted to all surfaces with boundary inside the unit ball, the boundary being free to vary on the unit sphere (hence the name free boundary). In this article, we will be concerned with the *index* of these free boundary minimal surfaces. We will assume for convenience that Σ is oriented, and denote N a unit normal. The index can be defined as the (Morse) index of the quadratic form associated with the second variation of the area functional. It is well-known that if Σ is a free boundary minimal surface, and Σ_t, $t \in [0,1)$ is a one-parameter family of normal deformations of Σ (thus, $\Sigma_0 = \Sigma$), the boundary of Σ_t lying in the unit sphere for every t, then

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial t}\Big|_{t=0}\mathrm{Area}(\Sigma_t) = 0, \quad \frac{\partial^2}{\partial t^2}\Big|_{t=0}\mathrm{Area}(\Sigma_t) = \int_\Sigma (|\nabla u|^2 - |A|^2u^2) - \int_{\partial\Sigma} u^2.$$

Here, u is a smooth, real function on Σ, such that the deformation Σ_t occurs at $t = 0$ in the direction of the normal vector field uN. Also, A denotes the second fundamental form, and $|A|^2$ is the square of its norm, i.e. the sum of the square of the principal curvatures. This leads one to consider the quadratic form

$$Q(u) = \int_\Sigma (|\nabla u|^2 - |A|^2u^2) - \int_{\partial\Sigma} u^2.$$

The (Morse) index of Σ, as a free boundary minimal surface, is then defined as the maximal dimension of a vector space of smooth functions on Σ, on which Q is negative definite. Unlike the index, there are several possible definition for the nullity of Σ: one option is to define the nullity as the maximal dimension of a vector space of smooth functions on Σ, on which Q vanishes identically (Option 1). Another valid option is define the nullity as the maximal dimension of a vector space *consisting of Jacobi fields*, on which Q vanishes identically (Option 2). In the case of Option 2, the nullity turns out to be equal to the multiplicity of 1 as a Steklov eigenvalue for the stability operator. The two different options give different number, so we have to make a choice. Arbitrarily, we decide to define the nullity as in Option 1. The quadratic form Q is naturally associated to a second-order differential operator, the Jacobi operator $J = \Delta - |A|^2$ (in this article, we take the convention that Δ is a non-negative operator). Index and nullity have been extensively studied for surfaces without boundary, in which case the index is simply equal to the number of negative eigenvalues of the Jacobi operator, and the nullity to the dimension of its kernel. However, the presence of a boundary term in Q make things more difficult. More precisely, due to the presence of a boundary, several legitimate eigenvalue problems can be considered for the Jacobi operator, in connection to the index (for example, Dirichlet, Steklov, etc...). See a short discussion of this in section 5.5.

To conclude this preliminary section, let us recall an interesting result, proved by Fraser and Schoen in [10]. For v a constant vector in $\mathbb{R}^3$, denote $v^\perp := (N, v)$, which is a smooth function on Σ. Then, by [10, Theorem 3.1],

$$Q(v^\perp) = -2\int_\Sigma |v^\perp|^2.$$

Furthermore, the vector space $\{v^\perp\,;\, v \in \mathbb{R}^3\}$ has dimension 3, unless Σ is a flat disk. Thus, every free minimal surface of the unit ball, that is not a flat disk, has index at least 3. Note also that $Jv^\perp = 0$ for all $v \in \mathbb{R}^3$. That is, $v^\perp$ is a Jacobi field. Of course, a flat disk is a free boundary minimal surface of the unit ball, if and only if it passes through the origin, and in this case it is not hard to check that it has index 1, by using polar coordinates and Fourier series.

3. The critical catenoid

In this section, we present the main protagonist of this article, namely the critical catenoid, and give some useful properties related to it. Let $\mathcal{C}_a$, $a > 0$, be the catenoid in $\mathbb{R}^3$ parametrized by

$$X_a(t,\theta) = (a\cosh(t/a)\cos(\theta), a\cosh(t/a)\sin(\theta), t) = a(\cosh(s)\cos(\theta), \cosh(s)\sin(\theta), s),\ s = t/a.$$

There exists a unique value of the parameter a such that $\mathcal{C}_a$ intersects the unit sphere orthogonally. Indeed, on $\mathcal{C}_a$ the unit normal is given by

$$N = (-\frac{\cos(\theta)}{\cosh(t/a)}, -\frac{\sin(\theta)}{\cosh(t/a)}, \tanh(t/a)),$$

so that the condition $\nu = X$ on $\partial\Sigma$ is equivalent to

$$0 = (N, X) = a^2 - t^2\tanh^2(t/a),$$

that is

$$1 - s^2\tanh^2(s) = 0,\ s = t/a.$$

We denote by T the solution of this last equation, and we consider only the part of the catenoid $\mathcal{C}_a$ corresponding to $t \in [-aT, aT]$, which is a free boundary solution in some ball. Explicitely, T is solution of the equation

$$\boxed{T\tanh(T) = 1.}$$

If moreover, one wants that $(N, X) = 0$ occurs on the unit sphere (so that $\mathcal{C}_a$ is a free boundary solution in $\mathbb{B}^3$), then one must have in addition

$$a^2\cosh^2(t/a) + t^2 = 1,$$

for $t/a = T$, that is

$$T^2 + \cosh^2(T) = 1/a^2.$$

Using that $T^{-1} = \tanh(T)$, one finds that

$$1/a^2 = \frac{\cosh(T)^2}{\sinh^2(T)}(1 + \sinh^2(T)) = T^2\cosh^2(T),$$

that is

$$\boxed{a = \frac{1}{T\cosh(T)}.}$$

Thus, the critical (free boundary) catenoid is obtained from the usual (free boundary) catenoid $\mathcal{C} = \mathcal{C}_1$, by dilation of factor a.

From now on and until Section 6, Σ will denote the critical catenoid as described above.

3.1. **A choice of coordinates.** In coordinates (s, θ), $s = t/a$, the metric on Σ writes

$$g = a^2\cosh^2(s)(ds^2 + d\theta^2),$$

with $s \in [-T, T]$ and $\theta \in [0, 2\pi)$. The Jacobi operator J is given by

$$Ju(s,\theta) = -\frac{1}{a^2\cosh^2(s)}\left(\frac{\partial^2 u}{\partial s^2} + \frac{\partial^2 u}{\partial\theta^2}\right) - \frac{2}{a^2\cosh^4(s)}u,$$

and the quadratic form Q writes, in (s, θ) coordinates

$$\begin{aligned} Q(u(s,\theta)) &= \int_{[-T,T]\times S^1}\left\{\left|\tfrac{\partial u}{\partial s}\right|^2 + \left|\tfrac{\partial u}{\partial\theta}\right|^2 - \tfrac{2}{\cosh^2(s)}u^2\right\} dsd\theta \\ &\quad -a\cosh(T)\int_0^{2\pi}\left\{u^2(T,\theta) + u^2(-T,\theta)\right\} d\theta \\ &= \int_{[-T,T]\times S^1}\left\{\left|\tfrac{\partial u}{\partial s}\right|^2 + \left|\tfrac{\partial u}{\partial\theta}\right|^2 - \tfrac{2}{\cosh^2(s)}u^2\right\} dsd\theta \\ &\quad -\tfrac{1}{T}\int_0^{2\pi}\left\{u^2(T,\theta) + u^2(-T,\theta)\right\} d\theta \end{aligned}$$

It will be convenient to change conformally the metric g on Σ, in order to see the resulting surface as a part of the unit sphere S^2 and hence to use the spherical coordinates. While not

strictly necessary (our proofs would work without it), it does simplifies the Jacobi operator. Thus, let us consider the metric $\tilde{g}$, conformal to g, defined by

$$\tilde{g} = (\cosh(s))^{-2}(ds^2 + d\theta^2),$$

and denote by $\tilde{\Sigma}$ the associated surface. Since $\tilde{g} = K_g\, g$, where K_g is the Gauss curvature of g, it follows that $\tilde{g}$ has Gauss curvature constant and equal to 1. Moreover, by a change of variable, one can see that $\tilde{\Sigma}$ is isometric to a domain of the 2-dimensional sphere S^2: indeed, if one tries to write $d\varphi^2 = \cosh^{-2}(s)ds^2$, one is led to define

$$\begin{aligned} \varphi &= -\int \tfrac{ds}{\cosh(s)} \\ &= -2\int \tfrac{e^{-s}ds}{1+e^{-2s}} \\ &= 2\arctan(e^{-s}). \end{aligned}$$

Then,

$$\begin{aligned} \cosh^{-1}(s) &= \tfrac{2e^{-s}}{1+e^{-2s}} \\ &= \tfrac{2\tan(\varphi/2)}{1+\tan^2(\varphi/2)} \\ &= 2\cos(\varphi/2)\sin(\varphi/2) \\ &= \sin(\varphi). \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, the metric $\tilde{g}$ can be written as

$$\boxed{\tilde{g} = d\varphi^2 + \sin^2(\varphi)d\theta^2 = g_{(S^2,can)},}$$

the canonical metric on S^2 written in spherical coordinates (φ, θ). The surface $\tilde{\Sigma}$ is therefore isometric to a domain $\{\pi - \varphi_* \leq \varphi \leq \varphi_*,\, 0 \leq \theta < 2\pi\}$ of the unit sphere S^2. In order to relate quantities expressed in s coordinates to quantities expressed in φ coordinates, one has the following computation:

$$\begin{aligned} \tanh(s) &= \tfrac{e^s - e^{-s}}{e^s + e^{-s}} \\ &= \tfrac{1-e^{-2s}}{1+e^{-2s}} \\ &= \tfrac{1-\tan^2(\varphi/2)}{1+\tan^2(\varphi/2)} \\ &= \cos^2(\varphi/2)(1-\tan^2(\varphi/2)) \\ &= \cos^2(\varphi/2) - \sin^2(\varphi/2) \\ &= \cos(\varphi). \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, since $-T \leq s \leq T$, and $T\tanh(T) = 1$, one concludes that

$$\boxed{(\theta,\varphi)\in\tilde{\Sigma}\Leftrightarrow -\frac{1}{T}\leq\cos(\varphi)\leq\frac{1}{T}.}$$

Concerning the quadratic form Q, using the conformal invariance of the Dirichlet energy in dimension 2, one can write Q as

$$Q(u)=\int_{\tilde{\Sigma}}\left\{|\tilde{\nabla}u|^2_{\tilde{g}}-2u^2\right\}dvol_{\tilde{g}}-\frac{\cosh(T)}{T}\int_{\partial\tilde{\Sigma}}u^2\,d\sigma_{\tilde{g}},$$

and one sees that the naturally associated operator in the metric $\tilde{g}$ is

$$\tilde{J}=\Delta_{S^2}-2.$$

Hence, as promised, in the conformal metric $\tilde{g}=g_{(S^2,can)}$ the operator associated to Q has a particularly simple expression.

3.2. **Jacobi fields.** Recall that, by a slight abuse of notation, a smooth function u on Σ is called a Jacobi field if $Ju=0$. For the critical catenoid, there are several interesting Jacobi fields that one can consider: one example that we have already mentioned in Section 2 is $v^\perp=(v,N)$ for v a vector in $\mathbb{R}^3$. Interestingly, if one considers the canonical basis (v_x,v_y,v_z) of $\mathbb{R}^3$, one obtains three Jacobi fields $v_x^\perp$, $v_y^\perp$ and $v_z^\perp$. These 3 Jacobi fields have the extra property of being Steklov eigenfunctions for J, that is, they solve a Steklov boundary value problem:

$$\begin{cases} Ju=0, & \text{on } \Sigma,\\ \frac{\partial u}{\partial\nu}=\lambda u, & \text{on } \partial\Sigma,\end{cases}\tag{3.1}$$

where $\frac{\partial}{\partial\nu}$ is the exterior unit normal to Σ on $\partial\Sigma$ (which is also equal to X, the position vector, by the free boundary condition). More precisely, by a straightforward computation, one checks:

Lemma 3.1. *The function $v_x^\perp$, $v_y^\perp$ and $v_z^\perp$ are Steklov eigenfunctions for the Jacobi operator J, associated respectively to the eigenvalues -1, -1 and $\frac{1}{\sinh^2(T)}$.*

Notice that by the Green formula, if u satisfies (3.1), then $Q(u)<0$ if and only if $\lambda<1$. This is the case for the functions $v_x^\perp$, $v_y^\perp$ and $v_z^\perp$. It will also be useful for future reference to write down the boundary values of these functions; to this end, write $\partial\Sigma=\partial\Sigma_+\cup\partial\Sigma_-$, with $\partial\Sigma_\pm:=\{(s,\theta)\,;\,s=\pm T,\,\theta\in[0,2\pi)\}$. Then,

$$v_x^\perp=\frac{1}{\cosh(T)}\cos(\theta),\ v_y^\perp=\frac{1}{\cosh(T)}\sin(\theta),\ v_z^\perp=\frac{\pm1}{\sinh(t)\cosh(T)}.$$

According to [4, Propositions 2.1, 2.2], there are also three Jacobi fields coming from Killing (rotation) vector fields of $\mathbb{R}^3$, and one Jacobi field coming from varying the parameter a defining the catenoid. The former are $v_{(x,z)}^\perp:=(-z\partial_x+x\partial_z,N)$, $v_{(y,z)}^\perp:=(-z\partial_y+y\partial_z,N)$ and $v_{(x,y)}^\perp:=-y\partial_x+x\partial_y,N)$, while the latter is $\xi:=-\left(\frac{\partial}{\partial a}X_a(t,\theta),N\right)$. By the fact that rotations with center at the origin preserve the unit ball and the definition of the quadratic form Q in terms of second variation of the area functional (see Section 2), it is obvious that

$$Q(v_{(x,z)}^\perp)=Q(v_{(y,z)}^\perp)=Q(v_{(x,y)}^\perp)=0.$$

Explicitly, in coordinates, one has

$$v_{(x,z)}^\perp=a\,\chi(s)\cos(\theta),\ v_{(y,z)}^\perp=a\,\chi(s)\sin(\theta),\ v_{(x,y)}=0,$$

with

$$\chi(s) = \frac{s}{\cosh(s)} + \tanh(s)\cosh(s).$$

It is easily checked that $v^{\perp}_{(x,z)}$ and $v^{\perp}_{(y,z)}$ are Steklov eigenfunctions for J, with associated eigenvalue 1. Concerning the Jacobi field ξ, one computes in coordinates that

$$\xi = 1 - s\tanh(s).$$

From this computation, and recalling that s ranges from $-T$ to T with T solving $T\tanh(T) = 1$, one learns that ξ is positive in the interior of Σ and vanishes on the boundary of Σ. The non-negativity of ξ implies that it is a first eigenfunction of J with Dirichlet boundary conditions. If we denote by $\lambda_1(J) < \lambda_2(J) \leq \cdots \leq \lambda_n(J) \leq \cdots$ the spectrum of J with Dirichlet boundary conditions, it follows that $\lambda_1(J) = 0$ (thus, Σ is a maximal stable domain of the catenoid, for variations preserving the boundary). Of course, this is a well-known fact (see [4]). Moreover, the Green formula implies that ξ lies in the kernel of the quadratic form Q, that is,

$$Q(\xi, u) = 0,$$

for every smooth function u on Σ.

4. The Dirichlet problem

A crucial ingredient in our computation of the index of the critical catenoid is to be able to solve the Dirichlet problem for the stability operator J. However, there is a subtlety that Σ is a maximal domain of stability for variations preserving the boundary, and so it not guaranteed that the solution to the Dirichlet problem for J exists (as, for example, with the function $\mathbf{1}$ on the boundary), and if it exists it is not unique (since one can add ξ to any existing solution). A way of getting rid of the uniqueness issue is to introduce a zero flux condition: for a smooth function u on Σ, let us define its *flux* on the boundary:

$$\Phi(u) = \int_{\partial\Sigma} \frac{\partial u}{\partial \nu}.$$

Before dealing with existence, we introduce a natural Fourier-type decomposition for Jacobi fields: working in coordinates (φ, θ) on Σ, and assuming that u is a smooth, real function on Σ, one can write u as a the sum of a Fourier-type series:

$$u(\varphi,\theta) = a_0(\varphi) + \sum_{n=1}^{\infty}(a_n(\varphi)\cos(n\theta) + b_n(\varphi)\sin(n\theta)). \tag{4.1}$$

Using the well-known formula $\Delta_{\tilde{g}} = \lambda^{-2}\Delta_g$ relating the Laplacian $\Delta_{\tilde{g}}$ of a metric $\tilde{g} = \lambda^2 g$ conformal to g, one easily finds that

$$\tilde{J} = \lambda^{-2} J.$$

However, as we have already point out in Section 3.1, $\tilde{J}$ is just $\Delta_{(S^2,can)} - 2$. Hence, $Ju = 0$ if and only if in (φ, θ) coordinates, $(\Delta_{S^2} - 2)u = 0$. Recalling the expression of the Laplacian of the unit sphere in spherical coordinates,

$$-\Delta = \frac{1}{\sin(\varphi)}\frac{\partial}{\partial\varphi}\left(\sin(\varphi)\frac{\partial}{\partial\varphi}\right) + \frac{1}{\sin^2(\varphi)}\frac{\partial^2}{\partial\theta^2},$$

one finds that u is a Jacobi field if and only if for every $n \geq 0$ (resp. $n \geq 1$), the functions $a_n(\varphi)$ (resp. $b_n(\varphi)$) are solutions of the following ODE, known in the literature as the associated Legendre equation with indices $(1, n)$ (see for example [1]):

$$\Big\{ -\frac{1}{\sin(\varphi)}\frac{\partial}{\partial\varphi}\left(\sin(\varphi)\frac{\partial}{\partial\varphi}\right) + \left(\frac{n^2}{\sin^2(\varphi)} - 2\right)\Big\} a_n(\varphi) = 0, \tag{4.2}$$

for $\varphi \in [\pi - \varphi^*, \varphi^*]$. This suggests to introduce the differential operators $\mathscr{L}_n$, defined by

$$\mathscr{L}_n = -\frac{1}{\sin(\varphi)}\frac{\partial}{\partial\varphi}\left(\sin(\varphi)\frac{\partial}{\partial\varphi}\right) + \left(\frac{n^2}{\sin^2(\varphi)} - 2\right). \tag{4.3}$$

The operator $\mathscr{L}_0$ actually corresponds to the "radial part" of the Jacobi operator J: more precisely, if u depends only on s (or, equivalently, on φ), then $Ju = 0$ if and only if $\mathscr{L}_0 u = 0$. It follows that $\mathscr{L}_0\xi = 0$, and since ξ is non-negative on Σ, the well-known Fischer-Colbrie-Schoen/Allegretto-Moss-Piepenbrink Lemma (see [8, Theorem 1], [11, Theorem 1.2]) implies that the first eigenvalue of $\mathscr{L}_0$ is non-negative on Σ, for . As a consequence, for every $n \geq 1$, the operator $\mathscr{L}_n$ has strictly positive bottom of the spectrum (with Dirichlet boundary conditions). We also observe that the equation $\mathscr{L}_0 a(\varphi) = 0$ is a regular ODE on the interval $(-\varphi^*, \varphi^*)$, and thus has a space of dimension 2 of solutions: explicitly, a basis of the space of solutions is provided by ξ and $v_z^\perp$. With these preliminary remarks, we can now turn to solving the Dirichlet problem for J:

Lemma 4.1. *Let u be a smooth function on $\partial\Sigma$, such that $\int_{\partial\Sigma} u = 0$. Then, there exists a unique solution, denoted $\hat{u}$, of the Dirichlet problem for the stability operator on Σ:*

$$\begin{cases} J\hat{u} = 0 \text{ on } \Sigma \\ \\ \hat{u}|_{\partial\Sigma} = u, \end{cases}$$

such that $\Phi(\hat{u}) = 0$, i.e. with zero flux at the boundary.

Remark 4.2. Actually, a similar result holds for general free boundary minimal surfaces in the ball that have index 4 (see Section 6). However, we think that the more elementary proof we give in the case of the critical catenoid, which uses the Fourier-type decomposition, is also enlightening.

Proof. We work with the Fourier-type decomposition (4.1) that has just been introduced above. Recall that $\partial\Sigma = \partial\Sigma_+ \cup \partial\Sigma_-$, where

$$\partial\Sigma_+ = \{\varphi = \varphi^*,\, \theta \in [0, 2\pi)\},\ \partial\Sigma_- = \{\varphi = \pi - \varphi^*,\, \theta \in [0, 2\pi)\}.$$

Denote by $u_\pm$ the restriction of u to $\partial\Sigma_\pm$, and decompose in Fourier series:

$$u_\pm = a_0^\pm + \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} (a_n^\pm \cos(n\theta) + b_n^\pm \sin(n\theta)),$$

where the $a_n^\pm$'s and the $b_n^\pm$'s are real coefficients. Writing $\hat{u}$ in the Fourier-type decomposition (4.1), one sees that solving the Dirichlet problem with boundary value u amounts to solving the following countable set of Dirichlet problems for ODEs: for any $n \geq 0$,

$$\begin{cases} \mathscr{L}_n a_n(\varphi) = 0,\ \varphi \in (-\varphi_*, \varphi_*), \\ \\ a_n(\pi - \varphi_*) = a_n^-,\ a_n(\varphi_*) = a_n^+, \end{cases} \tag{4.4}$$

and the same for b_n, $n \geq 1$, upon replacing $a_n^\pm$ by $b_n^\pm$. Since $\mathscr{L}_0 \xi = 0$, $\xi \geq 0$ vanishing on $\pm\varphi_*$, it follows that $\mathscr{L}_0$ cannot be non-negative (for the Dirichlet boundary conditions) in any interval $(-(\varphi^* + \varepsilon), \varphi^* + \varepsilon)$, $\varepsilon > 0$. Therefore, it is not guaranteed that the Dirichlet problem 4.4 associated to $\mathscr{L}_0$ is solvable, and indeed, it is not. On the other hand, the operators $\mathscr{L}_n$, $n \geq 1$, are all positive (for the Dirichlet boundary conditions) in a neighborhood of $[-\varphi^*, \varphi^*]$, since they have positive first Dirichlet eigenvalue on $[\pi - \varphi^*, \varphi^*]$. If follows that the Dirichlet problem associated to $\mathscr{L}_n$, $n \geq 1$, is uniquely solvable on $[-\varphi_*, \varphi_*]$. Therefore, one can define uniquely $a_n(\varphi)$ and $b_n(\varphi)$, $n \geq 1$. Concerning $a_0(\varphi)$, since a basis of the space of solutions of $\mathscr{L}_0 w = 0$ is provided by ξ and $v_z^\perp$, one can write

$$a_0 = a\xi + b v_z^\perp.$$

It is easily checked that $\Phi(v_z^\perp) = 0$, and $\Phi(\xi) < 0$, therefore the flux condition on $\hat{u}$ is equivalent to $a = 0$ in the above decomposition. Furthermore, since $\int_{\partial\Sigma} u = 0$, it follows that $a_0^+ + a_0^- = 0$, hence, recalling the value of $v_z^\perp$ on $\partial\Sigma$, there is indeed a constant b such that

$$b v_z^\perp|_{\{\varphi = \varphi^*\}} = a_0^+,\ b v_z^\perp|_{\{\varphi = \pi - \varphi^*\}} = a_0^-.$$

Thus the Dirichlet problem for a_0 is uniquely solvable under the flux condition, hence the result. ■

5. Index of the critical catenoid

Our aim in this section is to compute the index of the critical catenoid:

Theorem 5.1. *The Morse index of the critical catenoid in the unit ball $\mathbb{B}^3$ is exactly 4. Furthermore, its nullity is 7.*

The idea of the proof for the index is to show that the vector space $\mathcal{W}$ generated by the constant function $\mathbf{1}$ and the Jacobi fields $v^\perp$, $v \in \mathbb{R}^3$, is a 4-dimensional space on which Q is negative definite, and with the following property: if u is a smooth function on Σ such that for every w in $\mathcal{W}$, $Q(u, w) = 0$ (in other words, if u is Q-orthogonal to $\mathcal{W}$), then $Q(u) \geq 0$. Then, that the index is 4 follows by standard projection argument. In order to make this idea work, an important point will be to decompose u, thanks to the solution of the Dirichlet problem in Section 4, as the sum of a Jacobi field, and of a smooth function vanishing at the boundary of Σ.

$$Q(u, w) = 0,$$

Remark 5.2. As we already mentioned in the introduction, if Option 2 is chosen for defining the nullity (see Section 2, Option 2 means that we consider only Jacobi fields), then the nullity is 3 instead of 7. This will follow from an obvious adaptation of our proof. In fact, the two nullities –let us call them $\mathrm{Nul}_1(\Sigma)$ and $\mathrm{Nul}_2(\Sigma)$– are, at least in the case of the critical catenoid, related by the formula:

$$\mathrm{Ind}(\Sigma) + \mathrm{Nul}_2(\Sigma) = \mathrm{Nul}_1(\Sigma).$$

5.1. **Index is at least 4.** Later, in Section 5, we will prove that every free boundary minimal surface in the unit ball of $\mathbb{R}^3$, that is not a flat disk, has index at least 4. However, in the case of the critical catenoid, there is an easy elementary argument, which we present now. Consider the Jacobi fields $v_x^\perp$, $v_y^\perp$ and $v_z^\perp$. Recalling their boundary values (see Section 3.2), it is easily seen that $v_x^\perp$, $v_y^\perp$ and $v_z^\perp$ are pairwise L^2 orthogonal when restricted to $\partial\Sigma$. We have already mentioned in Section 3.2 that $v_x^\perp$, $v_y^\perp$ and $v_z^\perp$ are Steklov eigenvalues for the operator J, that is they satisfy the boundary value problem (3.1). But by the Green formula, if $Ju = 0$ and $\frac{\partial u}{\partial \nu} = \lambda u$, then

$$\begin{aligned} Q(u,v) &= \int_{\partial\Sigma} v(\tfrac{\partial u}{\partial \nu} - u) \\ &= (\lambda - 1)\int_{\partial\Sigma} uv. \end{aligned}$$

and so we conclude from the pairwise L^2-orthogonality of $v_x^\perp$, $v_y^\perp$ and $v_z^\perp$ on $\partial\Sigma$ that

$$0 = Q(v_x^\perp, v_y^\perp) = Q(v_x^\perp, v_z^\perp) = Q(v_y^\perp, v_z^\perp).$$

Also, if one considers the constant function $\mathbf{1}$ on Σ, one has obviously

$$Q(\mathbf{1}) = -\int_\Sigma |A|^2 - L(\partial\Sigma) < 0,$$

and moreover by the above Green formula, and using the fact that

$$0 = \int_{\partial\Sigma} v_x^\perp = \int_{\partial\Sigma} v_y^\perp = \int_{\partial\Sigma} v_z^\perp,$$

one sees that

$$Q(\mathbf{1}, v_x^\perp) = Q(\mathbf{1}, v_y^\perp) = Q(\mathbf{1}, v_z^\perp) = 0.$$

From this discussion, we conclude that the quadratic form Q is negative on the vector space generated by $\mathbf{1}$ and the $v^\perp$, $v \in \mathbb{R}^3$. Since this is a 4-dimensional space, we conclude that the index of Σ is at least 4.

5.2. **Index and Jacobi fields.** Before proving the upper bound for the index, we need a crucial preliminary result, which states as follows:

Proposition 5.3. *Let u be a Jacobi field on Σ, such that*

$$0 = \int_{\partial\Sigma} u = \int_{\partial\Sigma} uv^\perp,\ v \in \mathbb{R}^3.$$

Then, one has

$$Q(u) \geq 0.$$

Proof. We work in (φ, θ) coordinates and use the Fourier-type decomposition introduced in Section 4:

$$u(\varphi,\theta) = av_z^\perp + b\xi + \sum_{n\geq 1}(a_n(\varphi)\cos(n\theta) + b_n(\varphi)\sin(n\theta)),$$

where for $n \geq 1$, $a_n(\varphi)$, $b_n(\varphi)$, are solutions of the associated Legendre equation (4.2). Actually, as will be clear later, we need to single out the solutions of (4.2) for $n = 1$ as well. Notice that

being a regular ODE of second order, (4.2) for $n = 1$ has two linearly independent solutions. One of them comes from the formula giving $v_x^\perp$ and $v_y^\perp$: indeed, as have seen in Section 3.2,

$$v_x^\perp = \chi(\varphi)\cos(\theta),\ v_y^\perp = \chi(\varphi)\sin(\theta),$$

with $\chi(s) = -\cosh^{-1}(s) = -\sin(\varphi)$ (see Section 3.2). Necessarily, $\chi(\varphi)$ must be solution to the ODE (4.2) for $n = 1$. Another independent solution is found by considering the rotation Killing Jacobi fields $v_{(x,z)}^\perp$ and $v_{(y,z)}^\perp$. Indeed, as we have seen in Section 3.2, one can write

$$v_{(x,z)}^\perp = \Lambda(s)\cos(\theta),\ v_{(y,z)}^\perp = \Lambda(s)\sin(\theta),$$

where $f\Lambda$ has some explicit formula. Expressing Λ in terms of the variable φ rather than s, we obtain a function –that we will still call Λ–, that must be solution of the ODE (4.2) for $n = 1$. All in all, the Fourier-type decomposition of u writes

$$u(\varphi,\theta) = av_z^\perp + b\xi + \alpha v_x^\perp + \beta v_y^\perp + \gamma v_{(x,z)}^\perp + \delta v_{(y,z)}^\perp + \sum_{n=2}^{\infty}(a_n(\varphi)\cos(n\theta) + b_n(\varphi)\sin(n\theta)), \tag{5.1}$$

where $a, b, \alpha, \beta, \gamma, \delta$ are real numbers. Moreover, it follows easily from the Green formula that this decomposition is Q-orthogonal, hence using that $0 = Q(\xi) = Q(v_{(x,z)})^\perp = Q(v_{(y,z)}$, one gets

$$Q(u) = a^2Q(v_z^\perp) + \alpha^2Q(v_x^\perp) + \beta^2Q(v_y^\perp) + \sum_{n=2}^{\infty} Q(a_n(\varphi)\cos(n\theta)) + Q(b_n(\varphi)\sin(n\theta)).$$

For $n \geq 2$, define a quadratic form Q_n on smooth function $f(\varphi)$, $\varphi \in [\pi - \varphi^*, \varphi]$, by the requirement that

$$Q_n(f(\varphi)) = Q(f(\varphi)\cos(n\theta)) = Q(f(\varphi)\sin(n\theta)).$$

More explicitly, Q_n is given by the following formula:

$$Q_n(f(\varphi)) = \int_{\pi-\varphi_*}^{\varphi_*} \left(|f'(\varphi)|^2 + \left(\frac{n^2}{\sin^2(\varphi)} - 2\right) f^2(\varphi)\right)\sin(\varphi)\,d\varphi - \frac{1}{T}(f(\pi-\varphi_*)^2 + f(\varphi_*)^2).$$

Thus,

$$Q(u) = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} Q_n(a_n(\varphi)) + Q_n(b_n)). \tag{5.2}$$

It is obvious that if $n \geq 2$,

$$Q_n(f(\varphi)) \geq Q_2(f(\varphi)).$$

Claim:

the quadratic form Q_2 is positive definite.

In order to prove this claim, we need a criterion for positivity of quadratic forms having a boundary term; we will use the following Lemma –which is actually true in greater generality–, reminiscent of the celebrated Fischer-Colbrie-Schoen/Allegretto-Moss-Piepenbrink lemma:

Lemma 5.4. *Let S be a quadratic form acting on functions $f(\varphi)$, $\varphi \in [a,b]$, defined as*

$$S(f) = \int_a^b \left((f')^2 + Vf^2\right) m(\varphi)d\varphi - \alpha(f^2(a) + f^2(b)),$$

where m is a positive, smooth function, α is a real number, and V is a real potential on $[a,b]$. Assume that there is a positive function $h(\varphi)$, $\varphi \in [a,b]$, solution of

$$\left(\frac{1}{m}\frac{d}{d\varphi}\left(m\frac{d}{d\varphi}\right) + V\right) h = 0,$$

and such that

$$-m(a)\frac{d\log h}{d\varphi}(a) - \alpha > 0,\ m(b)\frac{d\log h}{d\varphi}(b) - \alpha > 0.$$

Then, S is positive definite.

Let us postpone the proof of Lemma 5.4 until the end of this subsection. In order to use Lemma 5.4 to prove the claim, we need to find a suitable positive solution $h(\varphi)$ of (4.2) for $n = 2$. Letting $x = \cos(\varphi)$, the equation (4.2) for $n = 2$ is transformed into

$$\left\{\frac{d}{dx}\left((1-x^2)\frac{d}{dx}\right) + \left(2 - \frac{4}{1-x^2}\right)\right\} a(x) = 0,\ -\frac{1}{T} \leq x \leq \frac{1}{T}. \tag{5.3}$$

It is easily checked that the function $(1-x^2)^{-1}$ is a positive solution to (5.3). Coming back to the variable φ, one obtains the positive solution

$$h(\varphi) = \frac{1}{\sin^2(\varphi)} (= \cosh^2(s))$$

to (4.2) for $n = 2$. In order to prove the claim, it is enough to check that the conditions of Lemma 5.4 are satisfied for h. We compute that

$$\frac{d\log h}{d\varphi} = -2\mathrm{cotan}(\varphi).$$

For $\varphi = \varphi^*$, this is equal to $-2\tanh(T)\cosh(T) = -2\sinh(T)$. Since $T = \frac{\cosh(T)}{\sinh(T)}$, we get that $2\sinh(T) > \frac{\cosh(T)}{T}$, so

$$\frac{1}{\cosh(T)}\frac{d\log h}{d\varphi}(\varphi^*) - \frac{1}{T} > 0.$$

One proves similarly that

$$-\frac{1}{\cosh(T)}\frac{d\log h}{d\varphi}(\pi - \varphi^*) - \frac{1}{T} > 0.$$

Thus, h satisfies the hypotheses of Lemma 5.4, and the claim is proved.

We are now ready to conclude the proof that $Q(u) \geq 0$, under the hypotheses of Proposition 5.3. First, notice that the assumption $\int_{\partial\Sigma} uv_z^\perp = 0$ implies that $a = 0$ in (5.1). Next, we claim that the assumptions $0 = \int_{\partial\Sigma} uv_x^\perp = \int_{\partial\Sigma} uv_y^\perp$ imply that $\alpha = \beta = 0$ in (5.1). Let us prove for example that $\alpha = 0$, the case of β being similar. Indeed, it is obvious that

$$\int_{\partial\Sigma} uv_x^\perp = \alpha \int_{\partial\Sigma} |v_x^\perp|^2 + \gamma \int_{\partial\Sigma} v_x^\perp v_{(x,z)}^\perp,$$

all the other terms vanishing. But recall that $v_x^\perp = \chi(s)\cos(\theta)$ with χ even, whereas $v_{(x,z)}^\perp = \Lambda(s)\cos(\theta)$ with Λ odd. Therefore,

$$\int_{\partial\Sigma} v_x^\perp v_{(x,z)}^\perp = 0.$$

Consequently,

$$\int_{\partial\Sigma} u v_x^\perp = \alpha \int_{\partial\Sigma} |v_x^\perp|^2.$$

From this, it follows at once that $\alpha = 0$ if $\int_{\partial\Sigma} u v_x^\perp = 0$. Hence, the hypotheses of Proposition 5.3 imply that

$$u(\varphi,\theta) = b\xi + \gamma v_{(x,z)}^\perp + \delta v_{(y,z)}^\perp + \sum_{n=2}^{\infty}(a_n(\varphi)\cos(n\theta) + b_n(\varphi)\sin(n\theta)),$$

therefore

$$Q(u) = \sum_{n=2}^{\infty} Q_n(a_n(\varphi)) + Q_n(b_n(\varphi)),$$

which is non-negative by Lemma 5.4. This concludes the proof of Proposition 5.3.

■

Proof of Lemma 5.4: we use a trick that appears in the proof of the Fischer-Colbrie-Schoen/Allegretto-Moss-Piepenbrink theorem, and that consists in writing an arbitrary smooth function $f(\varphi)$ as a product with h:

$$f(\varphi) = g(\varphi)h(\varphi).$$

One then expand the term $(f')^2$, to find that

$$S(f) = \int_a^b \left(g^2(h')^2 + \frac{1}{2}(g^2)'(h^2)' + h^2(g')^2 + Vg^2h^2 \right) m - \alpha(f^2(a) + f^2(b)).$$

Upon integrating by part the term $(g^2)'(h^2)'$, one finds, using the hypothesis on h,

$$\begin{aligned} S(f) &= \int_a^b \left(\tfrac{1}{m}\tfrac{d}{d\varphi}\left(m\tfrac{dh}{d\varphi}\right) + Vh\right) hg^2 m + \int_a^b h^2(g')^2 m + \left[mg^2 h\tfrac{dh}{d\varphi}\right]_a^b - \alpha(f^2(a)+f^2(b)) \\ &= \int_a^b h^2(g')^2 m + f^2(a)\left(-m(a)\tfrac{d\log h}{d\varphi}(a) - \alpha\right) + f^2(b)\left(-m(b)\tfrac{d\log h}{d\varphi}(b) - \alpha\right), \end{aligned}$$

and the result of Lemma 5.4 follows immediately.

□

5.3. **Index is at most** 4**.** With the result of Proposition 5.3 at hand, one can now finish the proof of Theorem 5.1. As mentioned before, the idea is to prove that $Q(u) \geq 0$, as soon as $0 = Q(u,\mathbf{1}) = Q(u,v_x^\perp) = Q(u,v_y^\perp) = Q(u,v_z^\perp)$. Let us define an auxiliary function

$$f = u + a\mathbf{1},$$

where a is chosen so that

$$\int_{\partial\Sigma} f = 0.$$

Since $Q(v^\perp, \mathbf{1}) = 0$, $v \in \mathbb{R}^3$, one has

$$Q(f, v^\perp) = 0,\ v \in \mathbb{R}^3.$$

Furthermore, since $Q(u, \mathbf{1}) = 0$,

$$Q(u) = Q(f) - a^2 Q(\mathbf{1}).$$

So, in order to conclude that $Q(u) \geq 0$, it is enough to show that $Q(f) \geq 0$. Let h be the unique solution with zero flux at the boundary of the Dirichlet problem for J, with $h|_{\partial\Sigma} = f|_{\partial\Sigma}$ (it exists by Lemma 4.1). Then,

$$f = h + g,$$

with $g|_{\partial\Sigma} \equiv 0$. By the Green formula,

$$Q(h, g) = \int_\Sigma (Jh)g + \int_{\partial\Sigma} g(\frac{\partial h}{\partial \nu} - h) = 0.$$

Consequently,

$$Q(f) = Q(h) + Q(g).$$

Since $g|_{\partial\Sigma} \equiv 0$, $Q(g) = \int_\Sigma (|\nabla g|^2 - |A|^2 g^2)$, which is non-negative since $\lambda_1(J) \geq 0$, i.e. Σ is stable for J with Dirichlet boundary conditions (see Section 3.2). Also, by integration by parts,

$$0 = Q(f, v^\perp) = \int_{\partial\Sigma} f \left(\frac{\partial v^\perp}{\partial \nu} - v^\perp \right),$$

and since $v_x^\perp$, $v_y^\perp$ and $v_z^\perp$ are Steklov eigenfunctions with eigenvalue different from 1, the condition $0 = Q(f, v^\perp)$, $v \in \mathbb{R}^3$ is equivalent to

$$0 = \int_{\partial\Sigma} f v^\perp,\ v \in \mathbb{R}^3.$$

Thus,

$$0 = \int_{\partial\Sigma} h = \int_{\partial\Sigma} h v^\perp,\ v \in \mathbb{R}^3.$$

According to Proposition 5.3, one concludes that $Q(h) \geq 0$, so $Q(f) \geq 0$. This finishes the part of the proof of Theorem 5.1 concerning the index.

□

5.4. **The nullity.** Now, we prove that the nullity of the critical catenoid is equal to 7, using elements of the proof for the index to diagonalize Q. Define the vector space $\mathcal{V}$ spanned by ξ, $v^\perp_{(x,z)}$ and $v^\perp_{(y,z)}$, and by $\mathcal{W}$ be 4-dimensional vector space spanned by $\mathbf{1}$, $v^\perp_x$, $v^\perp_y$ and $v^\perp_z$. As we have shown in Section 5.1, Q is negative definite on $\mathcal{W}$, and vanishes identically on $\mathcal{V}$. Define also an infinite dimensional vector space $\mathcal{T}$ consisting in all Jacobi fields u having their decomposition (5.1) writing:

$$u = \sum_{n=2}^{\infty} (a_n(\varphi)\cos(n\theta) + b_n(\varphi)\sin(n\theta)).$$

By the claim in the proof of Proposition 5.3, Q is positive definite on $\mathcal{T}$. Finally, define a vector space $\mathcal{R}$ consisting of all smooth functions u on Σ vanishing identically at the boundary, and such that $\int_\Sigma u\xi = 0$. By the fact that $\lambda_2(J) > 0$, Q is positive definite on $\mathcal{R}$. We claim that

$$C^\infty(\Sigma) = \mathcal{W} \oplus \mathcal{V} \oplus \mathcal{T} \oplus \mathcal{R}, \tag{5.4}$$

the sum being Q-orthogonal, thus we have in a sense "diagonalized" Q. That the sum on the right hand side of (5.4) is Q-orthogonal is easy and follows from arguments that we have already used. It remains to prove that every $u \in C^\infty(\Sigma)$ can be written as

$$u = a\mathbf{1} + b\xi + v^\perp + \alpha v^\perp_{(x,z)} + \beta v^\perp_{(y,z)} + \sum_{n=2}^{\infty} (a_n(\varphi)\cos(n\theta) + b_n(\varphi)\sin(n\theta)) + g, \tag{5.5}$$

where g vanishes on $\partial\Sigma$ and is L^2-orthogonal to ξ. To this end, choose a such that $f := u - a\mathbf{1}$ satisfies

$$\int_{\partial\Sigma} f = 0.$$

Then, by Lemma 4.1, we know that one can solve uniquely the Dirichlet problem for f, i.e. one can write $f = g + h$ with $Jh = 0$, h having zero flux at the boundary, and $g|_{\partial\Sigma} = 0$. We write the decomposition (5.1) for h: since it has flux zero at the boundary, it writes

$$h = v^\perp + \alpha v^\perp_{(x,z)} + \beta v^\perp_{(y,z)} + \sum_{n=2}^{\infty} (a_n(\varphi)\cos(n\theta) + b_n(\varphi)\sin(n\theta)),$$

for some $v \in \mathbb{R}^3$ and some real constants α, β. On the other hand, one can write $g = \tilde{g} + b\xi$, for some real constant b, such that $\tilde{g}$ is L^2-orthogonal to ξ. Putting everything together, one obtains (5.4) with g replaced by $\tilde{g}$.

Once we have "diagonalized" Q thanks to (5.4), one can prove that the nullity is 7. To exhibit a 7-dimensional space on which Q vanishes identically, take any 4 functions w_1, w_2, w_3 and w_4 having the following properties: first, the w_i's are pairwise Q-orthogonal, and each w_i, $i = 1, \cdots, 4$ belongs to $\mathcal{T} \oplus \mathcal{R}$ (thus, is orthogonal to $\mathcal{V} \oplus \mathcal{W}$). In particular, the w_i's have positive Q-energy. Next, normalize the w_i's so that

$$Q(w_1) = -Q(\mathbf{1}),\ Q(w_2) = -Q(v^\perp_x),\ Q(w_3) = -Q(v^\perp_y),\ Q(w_4) = -Q(v^\perp_z).$$

Consider the 7-dimensional space $\mathcal{Z}$ linearly spanned by ξ, $v^\perp_{(x,z)}$, $v^\perp_{(y,z)}$, $\mathbf{1}+w_1$, $v^\perp_x + w_2$, $v^\perp_y + w_3$ and $v^\perp_z + w_4$. Obviously, thanks to the hypotheses made on the w_i's, these 7 elements are pairwise Q-orthogonal. Moreover, their Q-energy is zero. It follows that Q vanishes identically on $\mathcal{Z}$, and

the nullity of Σ is at least 7. To prove the converse, recall the decomposition (5.5). If there was an 8-dimensional vector space on which Q vanishes identically, since $\mathcal{V} \oplus \mathcal{W}$ is 7-dimensional, one would get by dimension considerations the existence of a smooth function u with $Q(u) = 0$, such that u belongs to $\mathcal{T} \oplus \mathcal{R}$. But Q, restricted to $\mathcal{W} \oplus \mathcal{V}$, is positive definite, contradiction. Thus, the nullity is exactly 7. This concludes the proof of Theorem 5.1.

□

5.5. **Consequences for some other boundary value problems.** As a consequence of our Theorem 5.1, one obtains information concerning other boundary value problems for the stability operator. Let us start with the Steklov spectrum. By this, we mean the spectrum of the "Dirichlet-to-Neumann" map on $\partial\Sigma$, associated to J; for example, the first Steklov eigenvalue is obtained as

$$\sigma_1(J) = \inf_{\{u \in C^\infty(\partial\Sigma)\,;\, \int_{\partial\Sigma} u = 0\}} \frac{Q(\hat{u})}{\int_{\partial\Sigma} u^2},$$

where we recall that $\hat{u}$ is the unique J-harmonic extension of u to Σ having zero flux, which exists thanks to the condition $\int_{\partial\Sigma} u = 0$. A k^{th} Steklov eigenfunction u_k for J is smooth, and satisfies, in addition to the orthogonality condition $\int_{\partial\Sigma} u_k = 0$,

$$\frac{\partial \hat{u_k}}{\partial \nu} = \sigma_k(J) u_k \text{ on } \partial\Sigma.$$

Note that by integration by parts, $Q(\hat{u_k}) < 0$ if and only if $\sigma_k < 1$. As a consequence of Theorem 5.1, one finds the J-Steklov eigenvalues of the critical catenoid, that are < 1:

Corollary 5.5. *For the critical catenoid, there are exactly* 3 *eigenvalues* < 1 *for the* J*-Steklov problem. One has* $\sigma_1(J) = \sigma_2(J) = -1$*, and* $\sigma_3(J) = \frac{1}{\sinh^2(T)}$*. A basis of corresponding eigenfunction is provided by* $v_x^\perp$*,* $v_y^\perp$ *(associated to* $\sigma_1(J) = \sigma_2(J)$*), and* $v_z^\perp$ *(associated to* $\sigma_3(J)$*).*

Proof. We already know since Section 3.2 that $v_x^\perp$, $v_y^\perp$ and $v_z^\perp$ are Steklov eigenfunctions with the above values for the associated eigenvalues. Furthermore, they each have negative Q-energy, so the corresponding eigenvalues must be < 1. Moreover, if $\sigma_4(J)$ were < 1, with associated eigenfunction $\hat{u}_4$, then the linear span of $v_x^\perp$, $v_y^\perp$, $v_z^\perp$ $\hat{u}_4$ and $\mathbf{1}$ would be a 5-dimensional space on which Q is negative, which contradicts Theorem 5.1. So, $\sigma_4(J) \geq 1$.

■

We now turn to a second boundary value problem for J, that is also of interest for the index. Minimizing the quotient

$$\frac{Q(u)}{\int_\Sigma u^2}$$

over all smooth functions u on Σ leads to a function that is solution of the boundary problem:

$$\begin{cases} Ju = \mu u, & \text{on } \Sigma \\ \frac{\partial u}{\partial \nu} = u & \text{on } \partial\Sigma. \end{cases} \tag{5.6}$$

More generally, one can define an associated spectrum $\mu_1 \leq \mu_2 \leq \cdots \mu_n \leq \cdots$ associated with the boundary value problem (5.6), and moreover the index of Σ is equal to the number of i's such that μ_i is negative. Hence, one obtains the following corollary of Theorem 5.1:

Corollary 5.6. *For the boundary value problem* (5.6)*, one has exactly* 4 *negative eigenvalues.*

6. Lower bound for the index and related results

In all this section, Σ denotes a general free boundary minimal surface in the unit ball of $\mathbb{R}^3$.

We come back to the general case of a free boundary minimal surface in the unit ball of $\mathbb{R}^3$, not being necessarily the critical catenoid. We start by giving a sharp lower bound for the index of non-totally geodesic free boundary minimal surfaces in $\mathbb{R}^3$:

Proposition 6.1. *Let Σ be a free boundary minimal surface in $\mathbb{B}^3$, which is not a flat disk. Then, the index of Σ is at least 4. Moreover, if the index of Σ is exactly 4, then $\sigma_1(\Sigma)$, the first Steklov eigenvalue for Δ, is equal to 1.*

Remark 6.2. As the proof will easily show, a similar universal lower bound for the index holds for also for a minimal free boundary submanifold M in the unit ball $\mathbb{B}^n$ in $\mathbb{R}^n$, $n \geq 3$: assuming that M is *not* included in a lower dimensional ball $\mathbb{B}^m$, $m < n$, one obtains that the index of M is at least $n+1$. This improves upon [10, Theorem 3.1], where it is shown that (under an additional small restriction on M), then index of M is at least n.

Proof. For $v \in \mathbb{R}^3$, define

$$x_v = \langle x, v \rangle,$$

then, because Σ is minimal, x_v is harmonic when restricted to Σ. Also, by the free boundary condition,

$$\frac{\partial x_v}{\partial \nu} = x_v$$

on $\partial\Sigma$. Therefore, x_v is Steklov eigenfunction with eigenvalue 1. In particular,

$$\int_{\partial\Sigma} x_v = 0$$

(this can also be checked directly using the Green formula with x_v and 1). Define the quadratic form

$$S(u) = \int_\Sigma |\nabla u|^2 - \int_{\partial\Sigma} u^2.$$

Then, $S(1) < 0$, $S(x_v) = 0$, and by integration by parts,

$$S(1, x_v) = \int_{\partial\Sigma} \left(\frac{\partial x_v}{\partial \nu} - x_v \right) = 0.$$

Define $\mathcal{V}$ to be the vector space spanned by 1 and x_v, $v \in \mathbb{R}^3$. Then, $S \leq 0$ on $\mathcal{V}$. Since $Q(v) = S(v) - \int_\Sigma |A|^2 v^2 < S(v)$ for all $v \neq 0$, and $|A| \neq 0$, it follows that Q is strictly negative on $\mathcal{V}$. Let us show that if Σ is not a flat disk, then $\mathcal{V}$ is of dimension 4. Otherwise, there is $(a, b) \in \mathbb{R}^2 \setminus \{0\}$ and $v \in \mathbb{R}^3$ such that $a + b x_v = 0$ on Σ. Clearly, $b \neq 0$, and then Σ is included in the plane $\mathcal{P}$ defined by

$$\mathcal{P} = \{x \in \mathbb{R}^3 \,;\, \langle x, v \rangle = -\frac{a}{b}\}.$$

This implies that Σ is a flat disk. So, if Σ is not a flat disk, $\mathcal{V}$ has dimension 4, and so the index of Σ is at least 4.

Assume now that the index of Σ is equal to 4. If $\sigma_1(\Sigma)$ were strictly less than 1, then there would be a first eigenfunction u_1 satisfying $\Delta u_1 = 0$, $\frac{\partial u_1}{\partial \nu} = \sigma_1 u_1$ and

$$\int_{\partial\Sigma} u_1 = 0.$$

Furthermore, the vector space $\mathcal{W}$ generated by $\mathcal{V}$ and u_1 is 5-dimensional, since u_1 is orthogonal to $\mathcal{V}$ in restriction to $\partial\Sigma$. Moreover, it follows from integration by parts that for every $v \in \mathcal{V}$,

$$S(u_1, v) = (\sigma_1 - 1)\int_{\partial\Sigma} u_1 v = 0.$$

Since $S(u_1) = (\sigma_1 - 1)\int_{\partial\Sigma} u_1^2 < 0$, it follows that Q is strictly negative on $\mathcal{W}$, which contradicts the fact that Q has index 4. Therefore, $\sigma_1(\Sigma) = 1$.

■

Corollary 6.3. *Let Σ have index 4 and is orientable, then Σ is stable in the sense that J with Dirichlet boundary conditions on Σ has non-negative (in fact, zero) first eigenvlaue λ_0. More precisely, the normal to Σ can be chosen so that the function $\xi := (X, N)$ is a positive Jacobi field in Σ. If moreover $\partial\Sigma$ is embedded, then Σ has genus zero.*

Proof. Stability of Σ follows from the proof of [10, Prop. 8.1]; let us recall the argument. By the Fischer-Colbrie-Schoen/Allegretto-Moss-Piepenbrink lemma, since (X, N) is a Jacobi field, it is enough to show that it does not vanish on Σ. By Proposition 6.1, we know that for every $v \in \mathbb{R}^3 \setminus \{0\}$, $x_v := (X, v)$ is first Steklov eigenvalue of Δ. By the nodal theorem for Steklov eigenfunctions, x_v has at most 2 nodal domains. According to S.Y. Cheng [5], at a point p belonging to the zero set of x_v, N nodal half-lines meet at p if and only if x_v vanishes at p to order N. Since x_v has at most 2 nodal domains, it follows that it vanishes only at order one on its zero set. Since this is true for any $v \in \mathbb{R}^3 \setminus \{0\}$, it follows that any plane passing through the origin intersects Σ transversally. Thus, the affine tangent plane to an interior point cannot pass through zero. Assume now that (X, N) vanishes at an interior point p. Thus, X belongs to the tangent plane at p. But then, the line containing p and having direction X passes through the origin, and is in the affine tangent plane at p, which is a contradiction. Therefore, (X, N) does not vanish in the interior, and we can choose the normal so that it is positive everywhere.

Assume now that $\partial\Sigma$ is embedded. Define a surface $\tilde{\Sigma}$ by gluing a disk on each connected component of Σ and smoothing out the corners of the obtained surface. Then, the map $p \to \frac{p}{|p|}$ is a local homeomorphism from $\tilde{\Sigma}$ into S^2. Thus, it is a covering map, and since S^2 is simply connected, it must be a global homeomorphism. So, Σ has genus zero.

■

An immediate consequence of the second half of Proposition 6.1, together with [10, Theorem 6.6], is the following result:

Corollary 6.4. *Let Σ be an oriented, free boundary minimal surface in the unit ball of $\mathbb{R}^3$. Assume that Σ has index 4, and is topologically an annulus. Then Σ is congruent to the critical catenoid.*

Finally, to conclude this article, we prove an analog of Lemma 4.1 concerning the solvability of the Dirichlet problem, in the case where Σ is a general orientable free boundary minimal surface in the unit ball, having index 4. We hope that this will prove useful for the characterization of

such surfaces. We first prove a lemma, for which we recall that $\xi := (X, N)$; also, by the free boundary condition, ξ vanishes on the boundary of Σ.

Lemma 6.5. *Let Σ be an orientable free boundary minimal surface in $\mathbb{B}^3$ with index 4, that is not a flat disk. Then, the function ξ satisfies:*

$$\int_{\partial\Sigma} \frac{\partial \xi}{\partial \nu} \neq 0.$$

Proof. First, by Proposition 6.1, we know that $\xi > 0$ in the interior of Σ and vanish on $\partial\Sigma$. Therefore, $\frac{\partial \xi}{\partial \nu} \leq 0$. It is thus enough to show that $\frac{\partial \xi}{\partial \nu} < 0$ in at least one point of the boundary. We compute:

$$\begin{aligned} \tfrac{\partial \xi}{\partial \nu} &= D_X(X, N) \\ &= (D_X X, N) + (X, D_X N). \end{aligned}$$

But $DX = id$, so $D_X X = X$, hence $(D_X X, N) = 0$ on the boundary. Thus,

$$\frac{\partial \xi}{\partial \nu} = (X, D_X, N) = -h_{xx},$$

where $h_{xx} = A(X, X)$ is the (X, X) coefficient of the second fundamental form. Let t be a unit tangent vector to $\partial\Sigma$. Then,

$$h_{tx} = (D_t X, N) = (t, N) = 0.$$

It follows that the matrix of DN in the basis (X, t) is

$$\begin{pmatrix} -h_{xx} & 0 \\ 0 & h_{xx} \end{pmatrix}$$

Assuming that $h_{xx} \equiv 0$ on $\partial\Sigma$, it follows that $DN = 0$ on $\partial\Sigma$, and thus N is constant on every connected component of $\partial\Sigma$. But $N : \Sigma \to S^2$ is anti-holomorphic, thus it must be constant everywhere on Σ, and Σ is planar, contradiction.

■

Let us now consider the Dirichlet boundary value problem for Σ, an orientable free boundary minimal surface in the unit ball of $\mathbb{R}^3$, having index equal to 4:

$$\begin{cases} J\hat{u} = 0 \text{ in } \Sigma \\ \hat{u}|_{\partial\Sigma} = u \end{cases} \tag{6.1}$$

As for the case of the critical catenoid, the Dirichlet boundary problem (6.1) for J is not always solvable. Indeed, there is an easy obstruction to its solvability: namely, if $\hat{u}$ is a Jacobi field, then by the Green formula,

$$Q(\hat{u}, \xi) = \int_{\partial\Sigma} \frac{\partial \hat{u}}{\partial \nu} \xi = 0,$$

but also

$$Q(\hat{u}, \xi) = \int_{\partial\Sigma} \hat{u} \frac{\partial \xi}{\partial \nu}.$$

Consequently, in order that (6.1) has a solution, $u = \hat{u}|_{\partial\Sigma}$ must satisfy

$$\int_{\partial\Sigma} u\frac{\partial\xi}{\partial\nu} = 0.$$

In the case of the critical catenoid, this condition is equivalent to the condition $\int_{\partial\Sigma} u = 0$ that appears in Lemma 4.1. It is thus a necessary and sufficient condition for solving the Dirichlet boundary problem for J. As it turns out, this is true in greater generality:

Proposition 6.6. *Let Σ be an orientable, free boundary minimal surface in the unit ball of $\mathbb{R}^3$, that is not a flat disk. Assume that Σ has index 4. Then, the Dirichlet boundary problem* (6.1) *is solvable if and only if*

$$\int_{\partial\Sigma} u\frac{\partial\xi}{\partial\nu} = 0.$$

Moreover, if (6.1) *is solvable, then there is a unique solution $\hat{u}$ of* (6.1) *satisfying the zero flux condition:*

$$\Phi(u) := \int_{\partial\Sigma} \frac{\partial u}{\partial\nu} = 0.$$

Proof. We have already seen that $\int_{\partial\Sigma} g\frac{\partial\xi}{\partial\nu} = 0$ is a necessary condition. It remains to see that it is sufficient. Let $\tilde{g}$ be a smooth extension of g to Σ (supported in a tubular neighborhood of $\partial\Sigma$). Then, letting $u = \tilde{g} + \tilde{u}$ and $f = -J\tilde{g}$, we see that (6.1) is equivalent to

$$\begin{cases} J\tilde{u} = f, \\ \tilde{u}_{|}\partial\Sigma = 0. \end{cases} \tag{6.2}$$

According to [7, Thm 6.2.4], there exists a solution of (6.2) if and only if

$$\int_\Sigma fv = 0,$$

for every v satisfying $Jv = 0$, $v|_{\partial\Sigma} = 0$. Since 0 is the bottom of the spectrum of J with Dirichlet boundary conditions, it has multiplicity one as an eigenvalue of J. Thus, (6.2) has a solution if and only if

$$\int_\Sigma (Jg)\xi = 0.$$

But by the Green formula,

$$\int_\Sigma (Jg)\xi - (J\xi)g = \int_{\partial\Sigma} g\frac{\partial\xi}{\partial\nu} - \xi\frac{\partial g}{\partial\nu}.$$

Taking into account that $J\xi = 0$, $\xi|_{\partial\Sigma} = 0$ and $\tilde{g}|_{\partial\Sigma} = g$, we obtain that (6.2) has a solution if and only if

$$0 = \int_{\partial\Sigma} g\frac{\partial\xi}{\partial\nu}.$$

This concludes the proof of existence of a solution to (6.1). Concerning uniqueness, just note that if u_1 and u_2 are both solutions of the same (6.1), then $u := u_1 - u_2$ satisfies $Ju = 0$ and $u|_{\partial\Sigma} = 0$, which implies that u is a multiple of ξ (and conversely). Since $\int_{\partial\Sigma} \frac{\partial\xi}{\partial\nu} \neq 0$, it follows that if (6.1) is solvable then there is precisely one solution of (6.1) with zero flux.

■

References

[1] M. Abramowitz, I. Stegun, Handbook of mathematical functions.

[2] L. Ambrozio, A. Carlotto, B. Sharp, Comparing the Morse index and the first Betti number of minimal hypersurfaces, arXiv:1601.08152.

[3] S. Brendle, Embedded minimal tori in S^3 and the Lawson conjecture, *Acta Math.* **211** (2013), no. 2, 177–190.

[4] P. Bérard, R. Sa Earp, Lindelöf's theorem for catenoids revisited, *Proc. AMS* **138** (2010) 3657–3669.

[5] S.Y. Chen, Eigenfunctions and nodal sets, *Comment. Math. Helv.* **51** (1976), no. 1, 43–55.

[6] F. Coda Marques, A. Neves, Min-max theory and the Willmore conjecture, *Ann. of Math.* (2) **179** (2014), no. 2, 683-782.

[7] L.C. Evans, *Partial differential equations*, Second edition, Graduate Studies in Mathematics, **19**, American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, 2010. xxii+749 pp. ISBN: 978-0-8218-4974-3.

[8] D. Fischer-Colbrie, R. Schoen, The structure of complete stable minimal surfaces in 3-manifolds of nonnegative scalar curvature, *Comm. Pure Appl. Math.* **33** (1980), no. 2, 199–211.

[9] A. Fraser, R. Schoen, The first Steklov eigenvalue, conformal geometry, and minimal surfaces, *Adv. Math.* **226** (2011), no. 5, 4011–4030.

[10] A. Fraser, R. Schoen, Sharp eigenvalue bounds and minimal surfaces in the ball , *Invent. Math.* **203** (2016), no. 3, 823–890.

[11] W. Moss, J. Piepenbrink, Positive solutions of elliptic equations, *Pacific J. Math.* **75** (1978), no. 1, 219–226.

[12] F. Urbano, Minimal surfaces with low index in the three-dimensional sphere, *Proc. Amer. Math. Soc.* **108** (1990), no. 4, 989-992.

[13] P. Sargent, Index bounds for free boundary minimal surfaces of convex bodies, arXiv:1605.09143.

[14] A. Savo, Index bounds for minimal hypersurfaces of the sphere, *Indiana Univ. Math. J.* **59** (2010), no. 3, 823–837.

Baptiste Devyver, Department of Mathematics, Technion, 32000 Haifa, Israel
E-mail address: devyver@tx.technion.ac.il